

A
R E V I E W
O F
Mr. GIB'S REMARKS
A G A I N S T

The late SYNODICAL FAST, *June 2d.*

By R A L P H E R S K I N E, A M.
Minister of the Gospel at *Dunfermline.*

ISAIAH lviii. 6, 7. *Is not this the Fast that I have chosen, to loose the Bands of Wickedness, to undo the heavy Burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every Yoke,—and that thou hide not thyself from thine own Flesh?*

G L A S G O W :

Printed for J. NEWLANDS, and Sold by him at his Shop in the Head of the Gallowgate; and by A. NORRY in Perth; A. WEBSTER in Kirkcaldy; J. BEUGO in Dunfermline; J. JAFFREY in Stirling; T. CAVERHILL in Jedburgh; Baillie CADDELL in Haddington; W. SMITH in Edinburgh; G. PATON in Linlithgow; J. PATON in Kilmarnock; R. SMITH in Falkirk; and G. FOREST in Linton.

M. DCC. XLVIII.

REVUE

ANNUAIRE

DE LA

SCIENCE NATURELLE



DE LA

DE LA

M

S

of
H
m
A
te
an
th
w
Se
an
be
fo
m

A

R E V I E W

Mr. GIB'S REMARKS, &c.

SEEING the *Remarks* on the Associate Synod's late *Aet* for a Fast, April 15th, 1748, pretend, as in the *Title Page*, to lay open the *Defection* and *Deceit* thereof, it will not be amiss to expose both the DISHONESTY and DISSIMULATION of these *Remarks*; and the rather, that as the Design of that *Aet* was to *sanctify a Fast to the Lord*; so the Intention of these *Remarks* was to PROSTITUTE and DISGRACE it, and to induce Members of the Associate Body to a Profanation thereof; which is the first Attempt, of this Kind, among Seceders, to rob God of what was thus devoted and consecrated to him. And therefore it may be thought the more expedient to examine, by some short Hints, whether any thing solid and momentous be offered in these *Remarks*.

A 2

And

And first of all, one cannot shun to observe, how this Performance of Mr. Gib's begins and ends with *vain-boasting*; seeing at the *End* he notifies the little Time he pretends he had for making his *Remarks*; and in the *Beginning* thereof, Page 4. he magnifies the Number of Ministers he had on his Side; setting, in a very deceitful Way, *Twenty-two* against a *Dozen*, and thence inferring, that the greatest Number must be the Associate Synod, *Nineteen* of them being Members before the Breach. But as this *Author* makes no Mention at all that *Elders*, as well as *Ministers*, were constituent Members of the Synod; so, let one suppose, that all his *Nineteen* were against the *Twelve* before the Breach, then, how could the *Nineteen* be out-voted by the *Twelve*? And why did not the Majority he boasts off, maintain their Place and Constitution, without withdrawing and betaking themselves to a *new* and *antisciptural Constitution*?

But since the Point, presently in Debate, is concerning that *Schism* which was made from the Associate Synod, on the ninth of *April*, 1747, and the Constitution of a *new pretended Synod* next Day, and since this *Author*, in order, it would seem, to *carry away Disciples with his Dissimulation*, and impose on the ignorant and unwary, represents their Number to be so far superior to that of their Brethren, from whom they went off, let us take a more particular Survey of the whole of that Affair, which stood thus.

By the *Rolls* in Custody, which can be produced, if demanded, it appears, that there were above *Fifty* constituent Members of Court present in the Afternoon's Sederunt, on the ninth of *April*,

April, when this *Schism* was made, *Twenty-nine* whereof were Ministers, and the rest Elders. Of these, *Thirteen* Ministers and *Ten* Elders, as this Author terms it, Page 5. stood under the Banner of a solemn Protestation; and when the Vote complained of was past, made a *local Motion*, as he calls it, Page 4. or went off, leaving *Sixteen* Ministers, and *Thirteen* or *Fourteen* of the Elders behind them, who continued their Sederunt till Business was ended that Night, and appointed the next Meeting in the same Place To-morrow, for *Fasting* and *Prayer*, which was observed accordingly. Upon the *tenth* of April, *Twelve* of these *Thirteen* Ministers, who had gone off from the Synod in such a disorderly Manner, together with *Eleven* Elders, constituted themselves in a *pretended Synod* in Mr. Gib's House; Mr. *William Mair*, who had left the Synod with them, having gone home that Day, and said to some, that he did not see, that they had Power to *constitute themselves*. Well then, are *Thirteen* Ministers, and *Ten* Elders, who made the *local Motion*, as our Author calls it, upon the *ninth* of April, 1747; or, if you will, the *Twelve* Ministers and *Eleven* Elders, which made the *New Constitution* next Day, are they the *Majority* of upwards of *Fifty* Members of Synod? Here is a *local Motion* of the *Minority* to Mr. Gib's House, pretending to carry the *Power* of the *Keys* with them, while the *Majority* is left behind, still possessing that Power. That the *Moderator*, the Rev. Mr. *James Mair*, declined to officiate, while the Question then in Debate was voted, as our Author asserts, Page 4. is a direct Falshood: Hundreds of Witnesses saw him in the CHAIR,
both

both *then*, and at the very *Instant* wherein they separated from the *Synod*: And both he, and the then *Clerk* have affirmed, in *Missives* under their Hands, now published, that they were then officiating.

But this is not all; for our Author, upon the Matter, asserts, Page 4. that *Twenty-two* Ministers, *Nineteen* of whom were Members before the Breach, made a *bodily* or *local Motion* from their Brethren, whom they left sitting upon that *ninth* of *April*. And in Page 5. he, in express Terms, calls them they left, the *Minority*, and those that had made the *bodily Motion*, the *Majority*; which is another direct Falshood, under which he has attempted to hide himself, as appears plainly from the Account I have already given of this Matter, and will yet further appear, if we enquire into the Manner how these *Nineteen* have come to be now the Members of their *pretended Synod*; and the Case stands plainly thus:

Two of that Number, namely, Mr. *Andrew Arrot*, and Mr. *John Cleland*, were absent from that Meeting of *Synod*; but, by *Ways* and *Means*, the last of these came up on the Week after the Breach, and joined the separating Brethren, tho' he had never declared himself inclined to any such Measures in the *Synod* before that Time, and had been absent from several of the Meetings of *Synod*, wherein the Matter in Controversy had been debated. At some of their other Meetings afterwards, Mr. *Arrot* joind them; and, no doubt, his Name, as is said of Mr. *Cleland*, *Introduction to Acts and Proceedings*, Page 10. was added to the *Roll*; which, out of their own Mouth, will prove their *Constitution* to be *NEW*; for

for the Names of such as were Members of a Court formerly, are not ADDED to the Roll.

Three of these Nineteen, viz. Mr. David Smyton, Mr. John Erskine, and Mr. Andrew Thomson, voted alongst with the Synod, in the first of the two Votes, by which the separating Brethren alledge that the Synod had lost the Power of the Keys; and so far were they from standing under the Banner of a solemn Protestation, as this Author is pleased to call it, that they sat in Synod that Night, after he and his Brethren had left it, and (excepting Mr. Smyton, who went home) met with the Synod next Day, and continued with them, till they rose, having appointed their next Meeting to be at Stirling: But all these three afterwards deserted the Synod, and joined the schismatical Synod, to their great Shame and Dishonour. Mr. William Mair, who went home from Edinburgh on the Day of the New Constitution in great Darknesh, came to get new Light, and afterwards fell in with the New Constitution. Mr. Isaac Paton, who changed Sides likewise after he left Edinburgh, soon joined them, heartily concurring with, and espousing their Acts and Proceedings. Thus we have got Seven, who, together with the Twelve that first constituted themselves in Mr. Gib's House, April 10th, 1747, namely, Messieurs James Thomson, Alexander Moncrieff, Thomas Mair, George Brown, William Campbell, Adam Gib, Andrew Clarkson, Patrick Matthew, James Scot, John White, George Murray, and Robert Archibald, make up our Nineteen, so much boasted of. And now, I leave it to every judicious and unprejudiced Person, to judge into the Regularity of that local Motion,

Motion, which this Author speaks of, when it was a *Motion* of the Minority from the Majority, both of Ministers and Elders.

It will be needless to insist on the new Term, *acting Members*, which this Author has invented, Page 5. to explain the Mystery of this *local Motion*, since it is a great Doubt if he understands it himself: But, besides the Falshoods already mentioned, and other calumnious Assertions in Page 4, 5. which are repeated, *ad nauseam*, in all their Performances, tho' their Falshoods have been sufficiently discovered in former Prints; besides these, I say, one can scarcely miss observing with what Arrogancy he asserts, Page 4. that they "are the *only Ministers* of the " *Secession*, who can be found *remaining* upon " the *former Ground*, with the *former Testimony* " of the *Associate Synod*." This leading, and bare-faced Position is equally true with what follows in the same Page, *That their Separation was no more than a bodily, or local Motion from one Place to another*: But who is so credulous as to believe, that the *disorderly* Call of a *private dissenting Member*, given in Synod, to that Party to meet separately by themselves, without the rest of the constituent Members of Court, together with their new Constitution, new Terms of Communion, new Tenets, and new terrible Sentences against their Brethren, had nothing at all of moral *Good* or *Evil* in them, but were merely Steps of *bodily Motion*? But, let any one suppose, that the smaller Number of his *pretended Synod*, should act the same Part to the *Majority*, which he and his Brethren that join him have done to the *Associate Synod*, leaving them

in the same Manner, and telling them that they had dropt the whole Testimony, and all the other Nonsense that he and his Party daily upbraid us with, and should yet further constitute themselves next Day, pass Sentence against them, and call themselves the only Ministers of the Seccession, that could be found remaining on the former Ground, with the former Testimony of the Associate Synod; according to this Author's Reasoning, all this should have been but a *local Motion*.

However, our Author fearing, it would seem, that the *local Motion* would be but a poor Defence for the strange Scene which they had now opened, he betakes himself to another *Shift*, which he supposes will be more effectual, and that is, to the *Extraordinariness* of the Case, which will atone for the UNPRECEDENTEDNESS of their Course, and consequently for EVERY THING else: "For, says he, Page 5. it is plain, that the Matter of *ordinary Forms* behoved to yield unto an *extraordinary Way* of maintaining the Cause of Truth, where *no other Way* thereof was left practicable." But besides the Boldness of this Supposition, that the Cause of Truth is on their Side, which they never have, nor will be able to make good, what Mr. Gib here advances, is indeed a *Latitudinarian Scheme* with a Witness; that proclaims a Liberty to all Men to transgress the Rule of God's Word, upon Pretence of *extraordinary Circumstances*, as if these would justify them in giving up with all *ordinary Forms*, and scriptural *Rules*; and as if some new frantick Invention, and not the Word of God, were the only Rule to be followed, in

B

any

any Case which they fancy, and foolishly call, EXTRAORDINARY. Our God is not the Author, nor Approver of Confusion; but has commanded all Things in his Church, to be done decently, and in order, 1 Cor. xiv. 40. And, thro' his Grace, we shall always esteem it safer to stand in the Ways and see, and ask for the old Paths, where is the good Way, and walk therein, that we may find Rest to our Souls, Jer. vi. 16. than to stumble in their Ways from the antient Paths, to walk in Paths, in a Way not cast up, Jer. xviii. 15. We will chuse to be Followers of them who, thro' Faith and Patience, have inherited the Promises, Heb. vi. 12. and go forth by the Footsteps of the Flock, Cant. i. 8. rather than fall in with an unprecedented Way, which Mr. Gibbowns, Page 5. that Course they have taken to be: Mean Time colouring over all their Extravagances with this Varnish, that it is "an extraordinary Way of maintaining the Cause of Truth," and that no other Way thereof was left practicable: Which is nothing else, but a setting up of their own Notions and Dictates, to be implicitly followed, in the Room of the unerring Rule of the Word.

This Author, Page 6. distinguishes betwixt dropping the whole Testimony absolutely, and the whole Testimony as among the Hands of the Associate Synod; that is, the whole Testimony as stated in a Way of Secession. This Distinction supposes a whole Testimony maintained by us, and a whole Testimony deserted by us; and therefore it is well if he understands it himself; for, certainly he brings a great Reproach upon the Secession, to suppose, that a whole Testimony can be
faith-

faithfully maintained, without being stated in a Way of *Secession*; because then the *Secession* would be schismatical, unnecessary, and unreasonable.

Again, He asserts, that our *second Vote* gave Allowance for contradictory Oaths, and a material Abjuration of the whole Testimony. Tho' this be nothing but a loathsome repeating of Things that have been sufficiently exposed already, yet let us see the Reason for this Assertion here: Why, the Reason is, because the Decision of the Synod, *April 1746*, concerning the Religious Clause of some Burgeſs Oaths, finds so and so, which Decision, says he, *they still professedly left standing*. But as the Reasons why we did so, are given in our *Act* declaring the Nullity of *their Constitution and Proceedings*, and such Reasons as they have never answered, and, it seems, cannot; so this Author hath forgot the Way wherein it was left standing, even under (to use his own Words in another Case) *the Banner of a solemn Protestation against it*, as a sinful and unlawful Decision, contradictory to the Word of God, and to our Covenants and Testimony. By which it is evident, that his *pretended Synod* hath proceeded in this Matter, in an arbitrary Manner, and upon the most imaginary Grounds, and that the *Associate Synod* had good Reason to declare so much in their late *Act* for a *solemn Fast*.

Page 8. contains an Assertion, that their new Laws and Terms of Communion are nothing else but a new Stand for the received Testimony, in Opposition to new Attacks made on it. Pray, what is this new Stand? Just a finding it to be a Sin to maintain, by Oath, the true Religion autho-

rized by the present Laws of the Land, and to renounce Popery. If this be the *new* and *necessary Stand* for the received Testimony, it is high Time for all the Friends of the true Religion, and the Enemies of Popery, to avoid and beware of this *new Standing*.

From Page 8. to the 16. the Author harangues at large, by many sophistical Distinctions, to free himself and his Brethrens *Acts* and *Proceedings* from the Charge of reproaching the Testimony, by their making it to *state a Quarrel* with the present National Profession and Settlement of Religion. This he both *owns* and *denies*, by so many Circumlocutions, that it is hard to tell if he understands himself; surely many of his Readers cannot. One famous Distinction of his, is betwixt the Church's *objective Profession*, and her *subjective Profession*. This thread-bare Distinction, which was new coined with this Debate, for disgracing the Religious Clause of the Barges Oath, is quite off from the Purpose; for, as hath been cleared elsewhere, that Oath is a swearing to the *legal Profession* of Church and State; that is, the *true Religion professed* and *authorized* by Law, which is the same that always was the Profession of Seceders, both before and since their Secession, till now that Separatists are denying it. Hence, secondly, it is quite foreign to make the Sense and Meaning of swearing that foresaid Clause to be an *acknowledging*, *approving of*, and *acquiescing in what Appearance for, and Maintenance of Religion the Church is actually making at this Day*; that is, as this Author afterward, and a Brother of his elsewhere, says, a *professed symbolizing with, and acquiescing*
in

in the publick Defections and Corruptions in Church and State concerning Religion. The Absurdity of this Sense of swearing to the true Religion, is so clearly demonstrated in some late Prints, that it is strange such *Nonsense* should be repeated: For, if a swearing to the true Religion established by Law, be not a swearing against all Corruptions and Defections whatsoever, then there would be no Difference between the true Religion and Corruption, nor consequently betwixt Heaven and Hell. The Sense then, in which this Author says they mean their *stated Quarrel* with the National Profession and Settlement of Religion, instead of being, as he calls it, a *plain Sense*, appears to be *plain Nonsense*; which, it would seem, wholly flows from the confounding of *Profession* and *Practice*, so frequently done by this Author and his Brethren; as if the *National Profession* of Religion authorized by Law, which we always hitherto made and owned in our Testimony, were the same with *Mens Appearance for, and Maintenance of Religion*, which they actually make, and which evidently relates to their *Acts and Practices*, but not to their *Profession*. So dangerous is it for Men to confound what God's Word makes distinct, *Tit. i. 16. Psalm lxxviii. 34,—38.* that all their subtil *Quirks*, in dividing and subdividing, mending and metamorphosing their *Phrases*, tend only to darken and deceive themselves and others, and to make them sink the deeper in the Mire of *Confusion* and *Delusion*.

This Author pretends, Page 12th, to find the Smell of a *new Tenet*, very subversive of the Testimony; as if the true Religion, says he, in *Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government*
had

had the same Establishment and Authorizing, upon the Matter, at this Day, that ever it had in Scotland. If this be a new Tenet, the Author should have made it appear to be so: For, to deny this Fact is indeed a new Tenet, subversive of the Testimony, wherein it is proved, in several Instances, that we adopt the same Profession with the present Judicatories from whom we made Se-cession, for their Defection therefrom; and wherein we assert, that our Religion is established by the Laws of the Land, which Laws revive and ratify all the former Laws establishing that Religion since the Reformation. Our Author seems here to conceal the new Tenet anent the *Erastianism* of the *Revolution Settlement*, which some of his Brethren have come out with; by which they plainly insinuate, that their new Constitution is better and purer than any Constitution that was in the Church of Scotland in her purest Times, which have been proved to have been all *Erastian*, if the *Revolution* was so.

Pages 14th, 15th, The Author seems plainly to give up the Cause relating to the Burges's Oath, in its Religious Clause, as a Thing they have never condemned, though yet it is a Thing about which they have made so much ado in all their Writings. Why, says he, the true Religion presently professed and authorized is one Thing, and the present professing and authorizing thereof, in this Realm, is another Thing; and it is this other Thing that the Synod all along means by the present National Profession and Settlement of Religion; so that their Quarrel about the Burges's Oath is not a Quarrel with swearing to the true Religion distinctly considered, but a Quarrel with swearing

to it complexly considered, under the Form of the said National Profession and Settlement. Now, A Reader, here you see the *Babel-building* upon the Burges's Oath, tumbling down, for this *Builder* overturns the Foundation of it; by shewing that it is *some other Thing* than the *Burges's Oath* they have been quarreling; that is, *some other Thing* than a swearing to the true Religion, presently professed and authorized; for this, together with the renouncing of Popery, is all that is sworn to in that Religious Clause. It is the true Religion, *materially considered*, that is there sworn to; for it is this true Religion itself, that is professed and authorized by the Laws of the Land; and if it be *some other Thing* than this that they quarrel, why *condemn the Burges's Oath*, and *excommunicate* all that will not do so? and then tell the World, it is *some other Thing* they are condemning; and indeed it must be *some other Thing* than the *Burges's Oath* they mean, tho' yet the *Half* of them do not know what they mean, nor does this Author seem to know what he would be at; for it is true, the *Burges's Oath* was never a swearing to, what he calls, a *professing and authorizing of Religion*, which would have been direct *Nonsense*; for, it would suppose that the Laws establishing the true Religion were *not yet framed*, but a *framing*, and that the Oath were a swearing not to a Thing *already authorized*, but to a *present authorizing* of it. Such a strange Shift made for Expressions, even contrary to the very Rules of *Grammar*, shews how hard it is for this *Author* to make the Acts and Proceedings of these Brethren consistent with *common Sense*, far less with *Truth*: Yet upon such Grounds as these
their

their high Sentences proceed: And, to use this Authors Words, *Oh! what Sort of Work is this!*

This Author supposes, Page 16. that a swearing of that Oath, was a swearing to the publick State of Religion at present in this Church and Land. But let him not forget his own Distinction, That the publick State of Religion at present, is *one Thing*, and the true Religion presently professed and authorized by Law, is *another*; and therefore his Quarrel with the Burgeses Oath, and with his Brethren that see it consistent with the Covenants and Testimony, is a groundless, mad, and unreasonable Quarrel. If he be of one and the same Mind with some of his Brethren, he might have plainly told, as they have done, that the grand Quarrel is with the *Erastian Revolution*; of which Abundance hath been said elsewhere, particularly in *Fancy still no Faith*.

Pages 17, 18, 19, 20. contain his Criticisms upon some Words contained in the Synod's Act for the Fast, and Words very cautiously exprest; but these Criticisms shew nothing but a captious Disposition, and a burning Zeal to slander his Brethren with that bare-faced Reproach of deserting the Testimony, by representing that *some late Writings* on our Side, *have expressly denied sundry Parts of the Enumeration of Evils in the Testimony*, &c. charging it with a Number of Falshoods. But this Author hath forgot, perhaps wilfully, that some Mistakes, relating to historical Facts, are acknowledged to be in the Testimony by *Writers on his Side*, as well as ours: And however subtilly he endeavours now to cast Iniquity upon his Brethren, yet if he resolves, before the World, to make these *Mistakes* the whole,

whole, or any Part of his Testimony, let him do so before the God of Truth, if he dare.

Pages 22, 23. This Author would fain prove the common Calumny cast upon the Associate Synod, as if they were giving up with, what he calls, the *Secession Testimony*, in Relation to Communion with the present Judicatories: And here he would have it believed, that our Secession was not only from the *present Judicatories*, but from the *Church-body*, as he calls it, *which these Judicatories do represent*. But if the Secession, as stated in the Testimony, was ever extended beyond the Bounds of the *present Judicatories*, this Author is desired, in his next, to CITE THAT PART of the Testimony; nay, he must frame a NEW ONE before he find it. And if any such Practices have been for some Years past gone into, as have transgressed the due Boundaries of the Testimony, and made Incroachments on the original Limits of the Secession, whereby the Secession and Testimony have been misunderstood, *as containing a Principle of refusing all Acts, even of Christian Communion in sealing Ordinances, with the Members of the established Church*, it is certainly full Time to vindicate the Secession and Testimony from such a false Imputation, and such a scandalous and schismatical Principle, as that of its being a *total, absolute, and unlimited Secession*, which the Testimony itself declares it was never intended to be, as hath been elsewhere demonstrated. For, in case of Reformation taking Place, with Reference to these Things that were the Grounds of the Secession, we have again and again declared our Readiness towards *Re-union and Communion*, even with these Judi-

catories from whom we made the Secession; whereas, the separating Brethren are building up Walls of *perpetual Separation* from the Church of Scotland, by making the GLORIOUS REVOLUTION itself a BAR in the Way of Communion with any that own the *Revolution Church* as such; which is a *new Ground* of Secession from it, never known before, among upright Seceders, nor ever contained in our Testimony; yea, so far remote from our Intention, that some who would have acceded to us upon that Ground, namely, of casting off the *Revolution Church*, were refused and rejected by us, and got their Accession cast over the Bar: But our separating Brethren are not only thus overturning our former Secession and Testimony, relating to Communion, and some of them asserting, that it was a Sin of *Ignorance* in them that ever they came under their *Ordination Vows* and *Engagements*, and were Members of the *Revolution Church*, but now have made such Terms of Communion, and Grounds of Excommunication, and these executed with such Fury and Violence against their Brethren, as evidences unparalleled Infatuation; and yet these *dreadful* Proceedings are what *this Brother* nick-names with the Term of *Faithfulness*, Pages 23, 24.

Where also, having justified the present Way of his Brethrens going about *Covenanting* Work, by setting it in Opposition to the *Bürgess Oath*; the Amount of his Defence thereof is, and must be, that it is a *Bond renouncing the true Religion*, presently professed and authorized by the Laws of *this Land*; such a dreadful Bond must their Covenanting be, if it be the reverse of the Religious Clause

Clause of the Burges's Oath: And if so, surely none but such as are blinded to believe Lies and Contradictions, will venture to profane the Name of God by such Covenanting. But why such Zeal, in this *Author*, against the Burges's Oath, who is said, not long ago, before this Question was on the Field, to have encouraged some to take that Oath in *Edinburgh*? But indeed if he had remained of that Opinion, it is possible, by this Time, he had been excommunicated, and delivered unto Satan.

Pages 24, 25. contain an Harangue, wherein he takes it for granted, that there are *no historical Mistakes* at all in the Testimony; and thence would infer, that the Associate Synod have been, according to them, as he says, *for a considerable Time, insnaring People into a Track of publick Fasts, as well as false Witnessing against the Generation, in pretending thus to fast about a Number of Falshoods, and yet now no such Uprightness and Sincerity in their present Act for a Fast, as one Syllable. anent such a Track of Provocations.* Now, what a solemn *Farce* is all this, bearing such a Pretence to Zeal, and yet therein imposing upon weak People to make them believe *Lies*, busked up with such a religious Garb! For,

1. If he says, there are no historical Mistakes in the Testimony, he not only contradicts his *Leading Brother* in the Vindication he pretends to make of their Acts and Proceedings, wherein he is obliged to acknowledge some historical Mistakes in the Testimony, though sore against his Will, but also he contradicts Facts proved to the Conviction of all that will open their Eyes and read standing Acts of Parliament.

2. He knows, that as these historical Mistakes were never wilfully put in by us, but through an Oversight at first, so it was never *historical Facts* properly, but *known Sin* or *Duty*, that was reckoned, by the Associate Judicatories, to be proper Parts of the Testimony, binding upon the Conscience, as they frequently declared to Acceders. But,

3. When these Histories came to be made the WHOLE of the Testimony, by the separating Brethren, it was Time to enquire whether their Practice was founded upon Truth, or if they were making *Lies*, upon the Matter, and *Mistakes* their WHOLE Testimony, which is indeed a monstrous Madness.

4. It should be reckoned a merciful Providence, that we ourselves have been stirred up to notice and correct these Mistakes in History in our own Time, which is far better (if we had the Humility and Honesty to acknowledge them) than that they had been exposed in future Generations, to the Discredit of Witnessing Work, and the Reproach of Religion.

5. Could this *Author*, after the Discovery God has made in his Providence, venture, before God, with Uprightness and Sincerity, to make that a Ground of Fasting, in any Congregation in *Scotland*, that the Reformation Period, from 1638 to 1649, was so far buried at the *Revolution*, that NONE of the Laws establishing the true Religion, enacted in that, or the preceeding Period, were ratified or revived by the Revolution Parliament? Could he, or any Soul, be exercised before God, with Relation to this, as if it were one of the Grounds of the Lord's Controversy with

with the Generation? Surely, if any ever fasted on this Ground, they needed only to be pitied for their Blindness and Ignorance. But as our Testimony never bore such a Falshood relating to the true Religion, as if it were not established at the Revolution, so when the Brethren have made some *unguarded Phrases* in the Testimony, to bear this Sense, as if the covenanted Principles of Religion were *wholly buried* at the Revolution, and thereupon have condemned the Religious Clause of the Burgeſs Oath, which, even as applied to the present Time, bears the real Truth in this Matter, and so have misled People to believe a Lie herein, the Charge is very high they have to answer for. Yet,

6. There remain too many Grounds of Fasting for the Causes of God's Controversy with the Generation, tho' none of these Things that are *historical Mistakes* be brought in for Grounds thereof; tho' this *Author* seems to think, that if these be indeed Mistakes, there is no Charge can be laid against the Land, nor Grounds to say, *We and our Fathers have sinned*: This is such a weak and foolish Supposition, that if the Author had considered merely what hath been but lately published on this Head, he might have been ashamed to make it. Surely our Fathers were faulty in not plying the Parliament at the Revolution to DO MORE than they did, with Reference to our Covenanted Reformation, and in that neither Church nor State did FORMALLY RENEW these Covenants; and at the same Time, the Corruptions and Defections of the present Generation, from the true Religion itself, are highly aggravated, that they abound even in Contra-

tradition to the Laws of the Land establishing the same. However, if this *Author* agrees in Opinion with his *Fellow-Writer* and *Vindicator*, he should have dealt more plainly, uprightly, and sincerely, by shewing, if he could, that the *Revolution* was ERASTIAN, and consequently that there was never a right and lawful Constitution of the Church of *Scotland*, till the *pretended Synodical Constitution* in his House, *April 10th, 1747*, which is proved above, to be made up of the *Minority*, both of Ministers and Elders, who were Members of the Synod, and present at the Time of the Rupture; and tho' their Numbers now be superior to ours, yet that can never help the ERROR of their first Constitution, which was plainly the LESSER NUMBER, arrogating to themselves the Power and Authority of the Associate Synod, without SECEDING from them, contrary to all the Order and Decency that ever was observed in a Court of Christ. But granting that they have more Ministers on their Side at present, and boast of NUMBERS as their Strength, a few Years may bring about strange Turns of the Wheel of Providence; mean Time let us glory in the Lord, and in maintaining the Order of his House, and following the Rule of his Word, and not in a Multitude running into Confusion, as if their *Number* gave them the Name and Power of the Associate Synod.

The superior Number of which this *Author* boasts, and the violent Course his Party are driving, give us just Occasion for *David's Prayer*, *Psalms xxv. 19. Consider mine Enemies, for they are many, and they that hate me with cruel Hatred, Marg. with Hatred of Violence.* But if any think
it

it is hard to charge their Measures with *Hatred*, *Resentment*, or *Malice*; let them know,

1. That tho' it is very difficult sometimes to prove *Hatred*, which is an *Heart-Sin*, yet, in the present Case, it can be proved, that ONE of the Brethren, who came to read their Libel of Lies and Calumnies, (by which, many say, the Sabbath was more profaned, than ever it was by reading the *Act* anent *Porteous*) wrote a Letter on the Saturday Evening before that Action, to the *Brother* against whom he mainly intended the Intimation of that Libel, containing a *Reply* to a *Warning-Piece* he sent him; in which Letter he reminded him, of the little Regard he shewed to a *printed Letter* of his, as having alledged, that *an Answer to it would have been an affronting the Judgment of judicious Readers, as you signify*, says he, Page 76. of your last *Performance*. Now, whether this *Advertisement* argued his going about that work, not without a Mixture of CARNAL RESENTMENT, is left unto others to judge.

2. As the ordinary Way of proving *Malice*, is by these two, namely, *Malum minatum*, and *Damnum secutum*; that is, *Mischief threatened*, and *Damage following*, so, that Mischief and Dishonour have been threatened, by certain *Leaders*, against some, in Case they would not jump in with their Judgment in this Affair, is what can, not only be proved, by *publick Intimations* of what they were to do, anent *drawing the Sword* against their Brethren, and that long before their pretended Censures and Sentences were enacted by them, but also by *private Letters*, bearing, under their Hand, a *Threatning of Indignities*,
which

which can be produced, if need be. And now, what DESIGNED DAMAGE hath hereupon followed, in the furious, tho' impotent *Lashes*, they have openly given to the Offices, Names, and Characters of their Brethren; and how many *Hood-winked* People are imposed on thereby, the World are Judges. But they seem to have forgotten, that God says, *Obad. ver. 10. For thy Violence against thy Brother Jacob, Shame shall cover thee. Zeph. ii. 10, 11. This shall they have for their Pride, because thy have reproached and magnified themselves against the People of the Lord of Hosts, the Lord will be terrible unto them. Together with Isa. lxvi. 5. Hear the Word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his Word; your Brethren that hated you, and cast you out for my Name's Sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; but he shall appear to your Joy, and they shall be ashamed.*

From this short *Review* of Mr. Gib's Remarks, it is left to the Consideration of the judicious Reader, whether they contain any Thing truly *solid and devout*, or rather any Thing more than *logical Quirks and Cavils*, which may be justly termed a *useful Fight* against a *sacred Fast*.

F I N I S.



SEPTEM. 19th, 1748.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The above *Review* was written by the Author about *three Months* ago, but by some Occurrences, mostly unknown to him, it was neglected to be published till now.